



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/534,669	05/11/2005	Tatsuya Ikeda	NGB-38149	6536	
52054	7590	08/19/2008			
PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108				EXAMINER MARC, MCDIEUNEL	
ART UNIT 3664		PAPER NUMBER 8664			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE				
08/19/2008	ELECTRONIC				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com
dchervenak@pearne.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,669	IKEDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MCDIEUNEL MARC	3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. The term "operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is determined by the primary teaching device" in claim 2 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The above term is not defined by the claim as to how the determination/permission/access is to be given by the primary device, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,245,990 B2).

As per claim 1, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot (see title) comprising: a manipulator having a tool at a tip end (see fig. 1, element 1, wherein the robot mechanism being considered having a tool), a robot control unit for controlling the manipulator (see fig. 1, element 2); and a primary teaching device and a subsidiary teaching device each for controlling the manipulator through the robot control unit (see fig. 1, elements 4 and 6), note even though elements 4 and 6 are not separate, but they are considered as primary and subsidiary, wherein operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is restricted as compared with operation capable of being conducted by the primary teaching device (see fig. 1, wherein element 4 being considered restricted vis-a-vis the teaching pendant).

As per claim 2, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is determined by the primary teaching device (being considered as design choice due to the broad nature of the limitation).

As per claim 3, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein operation capable of being conducted by the subsidiary teaching device is classified as a user level by the primary teaching device (see fig. 1, element 4, wherein the user/operator initiate the command), and the

subsidiary teaching device includes a user level judging function (see fig. 1, elements 3-4, and abstract particularly “A robot control unit for controlling a robot mechanism unit constantly detects the status of a robot and stores it as robot status data” being taken as judging).

As per claim 4, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein the primary teaching device and subsidiary teaching device are detachably attached to the robot control unit (element 4 being taken as detachable, due to its well known in the art), and either the primary teaching device or the subsidiary teaching device is connected to the robot control unit (see fig. 1, elements 2-4).

As per claim 5, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein the robot control unit includes a storage device for storing information to restrict operation when the primary teaching device or the subsidiary teaching device is connected to the robot control unit (see fig. 1, elements 2, 4, 6 and abstract, wherein according to the status being taken as judging).

As per claim 6, Watanabe et al., teaches an industrial robot wherein the primary teaching device and subsidiary teaching device are simultaneously connected to the robot control unit, and the primary teaching device includes a user judging function (see fig. 1, elements 4, 6 and abstract, wherein according to the status being taken as judging as noted above).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MCDIEUNEL MARC whose telephone number is (571)272-6964. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on (571) 272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/McDieunel Marc/
Examiner, Art Unit 3664

Wednesday, August 06, 2008
/KHOI TRAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664